UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,688	10/10/2001	Daniel R. Drake	RSW920010146US1	7959

7590   04/19/2004

Gerald R. Woods
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER
VO, TED T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	3

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/974,688	DRAKE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ted T. Vo	2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _10 October 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-11_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-11_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _2_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the application filed on 10/10/2001.

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3.   Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Ludascher et al., "Towards self-validating knowledge-based archives", IEEE, 4-2001.

As per claim 1: Ludascher discloses,

"*A method of improving data validation, comprising steps of: defining one or more validation criteria* (see "XML-based", page 10, left column, see abstract, "model validators"); *and*

encapsulating the defined validation criteria with a data model to which they apply" (see "encapsulated", page 11, right column, last two lines).

As per claim 2: Ludascher discloses, "*The method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of using the defined validation criteria to validate a data value for the data model*" (see paragraph "Information Hierarchy", page 11).

As per claim 3: Ludascher discloses, "*The method according to claim 1, wherein the validation criteria are expressed in a markup language notation*" (see entire reference, referring to "XML elements").

As per claim 4: Ludascher discloses, "*The method according to claim 3, wherein the markup language*

notation is XML ("Extensible Markup Language) notation" (see entire reference, referring to "XML

elements").

As per claim 5: Ludascher discloses, "*The method according to claim 1, wherein the data model and the*

validation criteria are expressed in a markup language notation" (see entire reference, referring to "XML

elements").

As per claim 6: Regarding,

"*A system for improving data validation, comprising: means for defining one or more validation*

criteria; means for encapsulating the defined validation criteria with a data model to which they apply; and

means for using the defined validation criteria to validate a data value for the data model": The claim

recites the limitation having claimed functionality corresponding to Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 6 is rejected

in the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 1.

As per claim 7: Regarding,

"*The system according to claim 6, wherein the data model and the validation criteria are*

expressed in a markup language notation": The claim recites the limitation having claimed functionality

corresponding to Claim 5. Therefore, Claim 7 is rejected in the same reason as set forth in connecting to

the rejection of Claim 5.

As per claim 8: Regarding,

"*The system according to claim 7, wherein the markup language notation is XML ("Extensible*

Markup Language) notation": The claim recites the limitation having claimed functionality corresponding

to Claim 4. Therefore, Claim 8 is rejected in the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of

Claim 4.

As per claim 9: Regarding,

"*A computer program product for improving data validation, the computer program product*

embodied on one or more computer-readable media and comprising: computer-readable program code

means for defining one or more validation criteria; computer-readable program code means for

encapsulating the defined validation criteria with a data model to which they apply; and computer-readable program code means for using the defined validation criteria to validate a data value for the data model": The claim recites the limitation having claimed functionality corresponding to Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 9 is rejected in the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 1.

As per claim 10: Regarding,

"*The computer program product according to claim 9, wherein the data model and the validation criteria are expressed in a markup language notation*": The claim recites the limitation having claimed functionality corresponding to Claim 3. Therefore, Claim 10 is rejected in the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 3.

As per claim 11: Regarding,

"*The computer program product according to claim 10, wherein the markup language notation is XML ("Extensible Markup Language) notation*": The claim recites the limitation having claimed functionality corresponding to Claim 4. Therefore, Claim 11 is rejected in the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of Claim 4.

Conclusion

4.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Reid et al., "Implementing Fudgets with Standard Widget Sets", CiteSeer 1998, discloses a system of validating from Haskell.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (703) 308-9049. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM ET. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam, can be reached on (703) 305-4552.

The fax phone numbers:

(703) 872-9306 (for formal communication intended for entry);

(703) 746-5429 (for informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

TED T. VO

Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2122
April 15, 2004